

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 are pending. Claims 1 and 2 stand allowed. The Office Action rejects claim 3 and objects to claims 4-7 as being dependent on claim 3. Claims 3-5 are amended and claim 8 is added.

The Office Action rejects claim 3 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,788,338 to Dinev. If applicable to amended claim 3, this rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 3 has been amended to include some of the subject matter of dependent claim 4 that the Office Action indicates includes patentable subject matter. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully solicited.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 is a strict standard. “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration is courteously requested. If there are any remaining issues that can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone counsel at the number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel E. Fisher, Reg. No. 34,162
Attorney/Agent for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO &
BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: DALSAINC-0045

Date: October 19, 2005